

### REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the above amendments, claims 1-17 will remain pending, the claims being currently amended in response to the rejections under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, for the reasons set forth in paragraphs 2-6 of the Action. No new matter is added.

The Examiner is correct that "the reactant" refers to the isocyanate-reactive component (B). Claims 2, 3 and 8 are amended to replace "the reactant" with "component (B)."

Claim 3 is amended to positively recite the presence of propylene oxide in the adhesive composition. In this regard, the Examiner is correct that the ratio recited in claim 3 refers to the ratio of EO/PO in the composition.

Claim 5 is amended to be more clearly directed to the embodiment wherein the component (A) is the component (b).

The dependency of claim 17 is corrected. In addition, for clarity, the last reference to "the surface" is associated with the surface of the second substrate.

Accordingly, withdrawal of each of the grounds for rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Since claim 17 is apparently free of the prior art, the amendment to claim 17 places this claim in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-16 under 35 USC 102(b), as anticipated by Robertson et al (WO 95/10555) (WO 555) is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

WO 555 fails to disclose that the adhesive composition has a total ethylene oxide (EO) content of more than 2.5% relative to the total adhesive composition.

On page 8, lines 8-14, WO 555 discloses that an ethylene diamine-based polyol has an EO content of about 1 to about 90% where the EO content "refers to the amount of ethylene oxide utilized in the preparation of the polyols ... ."

There is no disclosure of an adhesive composition wherein the amount of EO, based on the total composition, not merely one minor component of the composition, is at least 2.5%.

Referring to the examples (since there is no disclosure relating the content of EO to the entire composition) it is seen that the maximum amount of EO in the compositions of Example 1 is 2.22 wt% in formulation B. In formulation A, the EO content is 2.19 wt% and

it is 1.59 wt% in formulation C. In this regard, in Example 1, page 13, the MDI prepolymer was prepared from Rubinol F-456, a polyether diol not containing EO. Synperonic T 701 (polyol 1) has an EO content of 10%. Synperonic T 304 has an EO content of 40%.

In Example 2, all of the adhesive compositions included only polymeric MDI but not a blend of polymeric MDI and pure MDI. Therefore, the adhesive compositions of Example 2 do not anticipate any of claims 1-16.

Since the features set forth in the pending claims are not disclosed in WO 555, the claims are not anticipated by WO 555.

In view of the foregoing, the claims are now believed to be in form for allowance, and such action is hereby solicited. If any point remains in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Attached is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and claims by the current amendment. The attached Appendix is captioned **"Version with markings to show changes made"**.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Pillsbury Winthrop LLP

By: Richard A. Steinberg  
Richard A. Steinberg  
Reg. No.: 26,588  
Tel. No.: (703) 905-2039  
Fax No.: (703) 905-2500

Paul L. Sharer  
Reg. No.: 36,004  
Tel. No.: (703) 905-2180

RAS\  
1600 Tysons Boulevard  
McLean, VA 22102

(703) 905-2000